

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

June 5, 2001

7:30 PM

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll. There were 14 Aldermen present.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas, Levasseur, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann

3. United Way presentation by Georgie Reagan and Gail Garceau.

Mayor Baines stated the City has experienced some extremely difficult times in its past but has always emerged healthier and stronger for each of these challenges due to the strong charitable nature of its citizens. If the network of social services is not maintained in our community as it did in 1935 we'll have to step forward and assume greater responsibilities as government for these services. The community of volunteer charitable giving is certainly a preferred approach while each of us makes individual donations of choice to our local church and to our favorite non-profit group it is in times of economic softening that small increases and diversified giving in addition to normal donations is most necessary. The Manchester community is more complex than our favorite charity and United Way has a proven citizen centered process for distributing funds effectively. In an effort to highlight the important of charitable giving this year, I am tonight asking elected officials, department heads, City employees and the community as a whole to join with me as we participate in the annual United Way Campaign. To try and set an example and model for giving in the community I am arranging a challenge between the Board of Aldermen and the School Board and certainly these two Boards do like challenges to compete to see who will donate the most to this year's campaign. I am similarly asking department heads to try to be the one who gives the highest percentage increase of giving in this year's campaign. And, finally, I am asking that the City of Manchester joint with 20 other companies in the greater Manchester area to be a pacesetter for this year's United Way Campaign. Pacesetters are a select group of organizations asked to increase giving by fifteen percent (15%). Last year, the City raised a total of \$35,893 to the campaign. The challenge to the employees of the City will be to raise \$5,384 additional dollars for United Way this year, a goal that is certainly achievable from the best, most generous employees in the State of New Hampshire. I'm also asking that we fully participate in the United Way Day of Caring. Along with over 500 private sector volunteers City elected officials and employees will help accomplish

much needed projects in United Way member agencies. I am asking department heads to be as generous as possible in allowing employees to participate in this one day volunteer effort that helps the community so much. Nothing could be more important to the future of our community than to teach our young people about their civic responsibility to help the less fortunate. Therefore, I have asked this year's United Way cabinet comprised of local business and civic leaders to work with the Mayor's Youth Council to explore opportunities for our young people to become involved in this community effort. We look forward to the Youth Council's enthusiasm and resourcefulness in providing a framework for helping with this year's United Way Campaign. And, finally, the community challenge this year is to try to give a little bit more than last year. If you did not donate to United Way or a participating charity last year, please consider giving a donation this year. Any donation will be welcome and will help us sustain the level of social services in our community. Some of you have a particular charity like the Police Patrolmen's Association or the Firefighters Fund...please take an example from others in the community and continue to support not only their favorite charity and give to their respective place of religious worship, but also donate to the United Way to keep a broader system of social services in place and functional for the community. Now, I'd like to introduce Kevin Clougherty who will introduce two people here tonight who are here tonight to talk further about United Way in Manchester.

Mr. Clougherty stated I've been asked to serve this year as the City representative to the United Way and to coordinate the City's effort and in that regard I have been working with George Reagan on my right, not Georgie. Georgie is George's mom is you read the agenda it says Georgie who is a prime example of somebody who gives a lot of their time and spirit to the City and should be commended for that and Gail Garceau who is the Director of the United Way. So, I am going to turn it over to them to explain a little bit about what they're trying to do with the pacesetter campaign this year.

Mr. Reagan stated I first want to thank Mayor Baines and Kevin Clougherty for their personal involvement in the campaign as they've had over the year's but Kevin has a heightened role and the Mayor only about two months ago spoke at our first CEO roundtable to try to raise the awareness of the campaign this year and the best part is that both of them are leading the way in setting an example for the City. The City raises, through its departments, as the Mayor had mentioned an excellent amount of money...together with the schools is more than \$70,000. We talked with Kevin and the Mayor about being a pacesetter because those are organizations that can set the pace for the community and help us achieve our goal. Every year we try to set a challenge in terms of raising money for the community. Over the last five years or so we've raised over \$13 million and that's significant when you consider the broad base of support our human service agencies need. And, we are there to help them and with your help I think we can really put a nice twist to this year's campaign in terms of being involved in the pacesetters and here we'd certainly like to ask your support as well by setting the pace in

your role in the community and we believe that that would be something that the City employees would also welcome. We have very talented, very focused and energized employees in the City of Manchester and I think that being a pacesetter campaign will really give them, I think the recognition that the City should have in terms of their involvement and it's a great way to do it and we'd certainly love your support.

Ms. Garceau stated thank you very much, Mr. Mayor, and thank you very much, Kevin. The only think that I would like to add is the importance that we see of the United Way playing a role as the community table in the greater Manchester area. We are, in fact, more than just a fund raiser. We are more than money in, money out. What we are doing is we are identifying critical needs within the community, we are bringing people to our community table and determining how those critical needs can be addressed. We have 31 member agencies providing 56 programs that really do address the most critical needs in the greater Manchester area. United Way cannot do it alone, we cannot do it without the agencies and we certainly cannot do it without the support of our contributors. Last year, we raised over \$3 million to provide services to those in critical need. We would like to do a lot more in the greater Manchester area and we can and we can do it with your support. So, thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. We look forward to your participation and we know that the City of Manchester will, in fact, set the pace and lead the way for the rest of our campaign. Thank you very much.

Mr. Reagan stated I think the one final thing we'd like to do is invite the Aldermen to our Pacesetter's Kickoff which will be on Tuesday, June 26th...Kevin is handing out the invitation. We'd like to have you there and we'd also like for you to keep the date of September 13th because that is when we'll recognize the City as one of those 20 select companies that really will help set the pace and propel us to our goal that we'll be setting next week, as a matter of fact. So, hope you can all make it, it's a great time to see the other companies and organizations that are committed to United Way as you are and it will be a great way to kick off our campaign this year. So, thank you.

Mayor Baines stated before we start the meeting, a brief announcement. This weekend June 8th and 9th will be the First Annual Downtown Manchester Jazz and Blues Festival. We've been working on putting this together well over a year, it's going to start a four o'clock in the afternoon right here at City Hall Plaza with the high school jazz musicians. We'll move to Hanover Street with a number of bands including the James Montgomery Blues Band and the Tommy Dorsey Big Band will be at The Palace Theatre...that's a separate admission and then we are going to have dancing on Hanover Street from about 9:00 till about midnight with the Mark Herbert Little Big Band. The next day we have a number of blues and jazz bands including the United States Air Force Jazz Band, Katie Dahl, Kenny Wenzel who is a Manchester area musician, graduated from local schools...is a renowned jazz musician...a couple of groups coming up from

Boston...Paul Broadnecks and others...it's going to be a great event. The tickets are \$5.00...\$2.00 from each ticket will go to support the High School Music Programs here in Manchester. But, more important than that is it's going to be a lot of fun for the City and bring people out...we're going to have great weather, the first weekend in a long time and we invite you to attend and all the people in Manchester to come Downtown. Again, starting on Friday afternoon, Friday evening and all day Saturday and then at The Palace Theatre the Philharmonic will be playing and then Saturday night is the first concert with the Charlie Daniels Band at Singer Park. So, it's going to be a musical weekend here in Manchester.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Baines advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

Approve under Supervision of Department of Highway, subject to fund availability.

- A. Sidewalk petition for 166 Moore Street

Informational – to be Received and filed

- B. Manchester Airport Authority Meeting Minutes of February 22, 2001.
- C. MTA Meeting Minutes, Financial Report and Ridership Report for April 2001.
- D. Minutes of the Mayor's Utility Coordinating Committee held April 18, 2001.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

- F. Resolution:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2001.”

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

- G. Recommending that Ordinance amendment:

“Amending Sections 33.024, 33.025 and 33.026 (Recreation Specialist I, Recreation Specialist II) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

(Note: Concurrent referral to Committee on Bills on Second Reading)

- H. Recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen approve plans entitled City of Manchester Flexible Benefit Plan, the City of Manchester Health Care Reimbursement Plan, and the City of Manchester Dependent Care Reimbursement Plan as amended and restated, and for such purpose a Resolution has been submitted.

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

- I. Recommending that regulations governing standing, stopping, and parking and operation of vehicles be adopted and put into effect when duly advertised and the districts affected thereby duly posted as required by the provisions of Chapter 335 of the Sessions Laws of 1951 and the Ordinances of the City of Manchester.
- J. Recommending that Civic Center Event/Guide Parking Signs be installed as listed.

HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN O'NEIL, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN PINARD, IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.

- E. Petition for rezoning of Map 713 Lots 2 and 3 Hazelton and Brown Avenue submitted by Attorney Lazos on behalf of King Family Trust.

Alderman Wihby moved that Item E be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading and to public hearing on June 25, 2001 at 7:00 PM. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Report of the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety:

- K. Recommending that parking rates be increased with times established as outlined, be duly advertised, posted and put into effect July 1, 2001.

Deputy Clerk Johnson advised that relative to Item K there was a substitute report that has been distributed to the Board and there are some items on that report that have been italicized based on actions of the Traffic Committee this evening and, therefore, I am requesting that the Board first take an action to substitute the report for what has been presented.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept, receive and adopt the substitute report of the Committee on Traffic. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated this was approved tonight and this is what I have in my hand this adjunct.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied the ones that are italicized...those are new items being added. There were three items added to this report.

Alderman Levasseur stated I have a couple of questions regarding this report. The effect of \$1.00 increase in the monthly rate for the garages...why did you go from \$55.00 to \$56.00 is that just a nominal increase or is there a reason for that.

Mr. Lolicata replied two reasons. We don't want to overdo this and we were going to bring this to your Board once-a-year anyway to look at these rates. We thought that would be a fair and equitable rate especially with what's going on with the parking signs right now. Down the road, maybe a year or two down the road you might want to go \$2.00...we can bring in different scenarios...we came up with a \$1.00 which we thought was fair.

Alderman Levasseur stated I never heard of it being just a dollar increase. I think last year it was \$35.00 and went up \$20.00.

Mr. Lolicata stated some cities have gone up a dollar.

Alderman Levasseur stated in the second line it says the Center of NH Garage...if they go with the monthly rate of \$75.00 they get to park there 24 hours a day and then two lines down the Center of NH Garage is going to be a \$12.00 fee if you park there. I would imagine that we would...rather than...because of the proximity of that garage we would not want to give out the \$75.00 rate, leave the rate at \$56.00 and then collect all of the extra revenue from all of these people who want to pay the \$12.00, it looks to me like that is definitely a money losing proposition right there especially because of the proximity.

Mr. Lolicata stated the intent of the \$75.00, I think dealt mostly with Victory and Canal. The Center of NH is a different situation all together because of the tower and the businesses they bring in down there.

Alderman Levasseur stated I didn't have a problem with the idea as far as the Victory and the Canal Garages because there are a lot of businesses in that area, a lot of law firms obviously work past six o'clock at night and it benefits them to be able to park there until nine o'clock without having to pay additional fees, but I would like to ask this Board not to include the Center of NH Garage because of the amount of money that we would be losing by the \$12.00 rate. I think that the Victory Garage and the Canal Garage are close enough in proximity to anyone who would park over there that it would be worth them to park in those two garages for the \$75.00 rate. I really think that that \$12.00 we would receive in revenue is more important than giving the \$75.00...I think we're going to lose money and I think we have an opportunity to make a lot of money because a lot of people who are coming from outside the City are going to want to park in that one. The people

who live in the City of Manchester are going to know where the good rates are and the better places to park.

Mr. Hoben stated that was an item of concern. We had a meeting with the Mayor and the Center of NH representatives and the office tower and they sat down with the Downtown merchants and it was a real concern that they wanted to leave it at \$55.00 with the option of \$75.00.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think we should leave it at \$55.00 or \$56.00 which is what you have for the other ones and leave it alone so we can get the big time revenue for the \$12.00 per parking space and I don't know if I need an amendment to that, your Honor, but I'd like to make that an amendment to take that out of there.

Mayor Baines stated I would like to hear more discussion about that because we spent a lot of time trying to alleviate the concerns of the people in the tower and the other businesses that have a long-time commitment to the Downtown and this was something...as I recall was very supportive of in trying to help with their situation there. I don't know if you want to expand upon that, Jim.

Mr. Hoben stated right. Bill Jones the office tower manager and he was very concerned because he has employees that work at night and we're kind of doing this in conjunction with Canal and Victory where they have lawyers working at night at the Victory and it was our intent to leave them alone and monitor it as we go. We know when they're leaving.

Alderman Levasseur stated I agree with that but I also think that the \$0.50 charged for any hour extra to stay late at night was what we had come to as a consensus at a prior Traffic meeting. In other words, if somebody is going to work until seven o'clock if they were paying the \$55.00 rate they're allowed to stay there till seven, I don't know how it got changed to seven, it was suppose to be six, but if they stay there and they're going to be working until nine then they can pay an extra dollar, but it is my believe that anybody who knows that a rock concert is going to come Downtown that they will make an adjustment to work a little extra the day before or a little extra the day after than have to deal with any kind of traffic coming in and out of the City and I believe that at \$12.00 a parking space we're really giving up a serious amount of revenue for that. People are going to have to make accommodations for when there is an event down here. If you're going to stay late...not everybody stays late every night of the week and we do have to pay for the Civic Center and we do have to pay for the parking and we do have to pay for the fee that we have to pay them and I really think if anybody really wanted to pay the \$75.00 and get that extra...if somebody stayed extra five nights a week or work later hours it doesn't behoove them to walk a couple of streets up to Victory or to Canal and not that far and I just think we're losing...and I think, Tom, you agree we're going to be

losing a lot of revenue with that because I would, I'll tell you right now, for the \$75.00 fee, I would move myself from the Victory or Canal Garages and park myself at the Center if I was going to be staying for a lot of these events because I know I'm getting the closest place and I can get out of there and get right on the highway because that is going to be the smart move and that's going to be a great deal for them.

Mr. Hoben stated we left it at that, we are going to monitor each garage and see who was leaving, at what time, and we'll know if they were going to events.

Mayor Baines stated I don't want to get into debating the point, we're asking for approval of this, we're going to monitor it and we're going to be ready to reflect changes.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to ask the Traffic Committee because I've sat in on some meetings but didn't they bring a professional down to the Center of NH to go over this entire Center of NH situation.

Mr. Hoben stated they haven't come back with their report that I know of.

Alderman Lopez stated they haven't had any input into this then.

Mr. Hoben stated they said they needed new software to the tune of \$42,000 to upgrade their software where they could split out the difference between who's going to the events and who's conducting business at the Center or the hotel.

Alderman Levasseur stated also what we're being asked to approve is the Merchant Validation Program..."approve concept of Merchant Validation Program including merchant contribution with staff to review details and present recommendations to Committee on Traffic at a future date. I would rather not approve something like that until we actually know the terms at this time because I don't know what the Validation Program includes, so before we even have something like that written into it we're giving a message that we are going to accept the Merchant Validation Program to businesses around here and we still haven't heard any of the details. So, again, I would like that stricken out of this report until we come to a further conclusion. Also, I'd like to go down to the Hourly Rates for Metered \$0.50 per hour...you're allowing people to park for 10-hour meters from 8:00-10:00 PM...actually, looking at the one over here...I'm sorry, the On-Street Parking Rates...\$31.00 per month Downtown On-Street Parking Permit from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM for a 10-hour metered space is east of Canal Street. Now, if somebody parks there for ten hours that's \$25.00 per week and you're going to give them that parking space for \$31.00 per month. Now, I was walking down in the Canal Street area today and the 10-hour parking meters were filled up today. As a matter of fact, almost all of them were filled on Canal Street. I don't want to see us shortchanging ourselves from \$25.00 per week to \$31.00 per month. If we're going to do something like

that to give them an incentive they're willing to pay the \$5.00 per day to park there anyway on the street...now, we're knocking this down to \$31.00/month...that's too low, we have to come to some...people are willing to pay the \$5.00 a day why are we going to give it to them for \$31.00 a month, that's not right. We're shortchanging ourselves some serious revenue here. I could see something like...we're making them park in parking garages for \$55.00 because we want them off the streets and here you go giving them a cheaper rate on the street at a meter and there's no incentive to go to the garage by getting this decal, do you want to explain that.

Mr. Hoben stated the Millyard always had a lower rate. Back when there was no one down there we instituted the meters when we were enticing the companies to come in. At that time, we instituted an on-street parking permits, not only for UNH students but also the employees there. Right now, I believe we have 750 Millyard on-street permits.

Alderman Levasseur asked what price are you charging them right now.

Mr. Hoben replied they're \$30.00.

Alderman Levasseur stated then you are actually going to one dollar. So, all of those people parking down there are actually only paying \$30.00 a month, they're not paying the \$0.50 an hour rate.

Mr. Hoben replied that's right.

Alderman Levasseur stated that's one heck of a deal.

Mr. Hoben stated we only went up a dollar because we increased the fees last year.

Mayor Baines stated this report has the support of the Traffic Committee, correct. We have a motion on the floor and a second, Alderman Gatsas.

Alderman Gatsas stated just so I understand. If I'm parking in the garage and I pay \$56.00 and I happen to stay until eight o'clock because I'm working in the office what would my cost be.

Mr. Hoben replied \$56.00.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would not be charged an hourly rate if I was in the garage and I left at eight o'clock instead of seven.

Mr. Hoben replied, right. We were going to let them go and monitor it. We know how many are leaving, at what time, etc.

Mayor Baines stated these people have been good to Downtown and in this proposal we sat down with them, we listened to their concerns, came up with something that we felt would protect their interests in Downtown...not drive them out of Downtown, protect the people who are working here and have paid their dues for a long period of time and we feel that this proposal does that and we can always be prepared to make adjustments as we go along involving the people involved Downtown and they want to be involved.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Levasseur duly recorded in opposition.

Report of the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety:

- L.** Recommending that regulations governing standing, stopping, and parking and operation of vehicles be adopted and put into effect when duly advertised and the districts affected thereby duly posted as required by the provisions of Chapter 335 of the Sessions Laws of 1951 and the Ordinances of the City of Manchester. The Committee notes that such regulations have been submitted to address resident concerns resulting from anticipated traffic issues relating to the civic center.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated Item L was removed from the Consent Agenda at our request...what we would like to do is have the report amended to add Green Street to the Resident Parking Only which was approved also by the Traffic Committee this evening.

Alderman Wihby moved to amend the report to add Green Street to the Resident Parking Only. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy asked where did adding Green Street come from.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied it was on the Traffic agenda this evening and was approved this evening. It was a street that was missed as part of the Resident Parking, so it allows the residents to park in the area.

Alderman Clancy asked are we going to have Green, Grove and Bell Streets also or just Green Street. Green's the first street, I know the streets, Joe, I used to live down there. I want to know how that was added, Carol, why should you just have Green Street and not Grove and Bell.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied we looked at the map for the area that was being approved which was in the agenda already and in that proposal there was a street that had been missed in the middle and that was Green Street.

Alderman Clancy asked is that going to go from Pine to Union or Pine to Beech.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied let me look at the report or perhaps Denise can tell you or Jim...Pine to Union. It does not include Union Street though.

Alderman O'Neil asked are you okay with that, Jim.

Alderman Clancy replied somewhat.

Alderman O'Neil asked what other streets are involved east of Pine because this thing has changed from what I last thought. Can somebody explain that.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied if you reviewed the report that was submitted originally that's in your agenda it reads "Pine Street, east side, from Valley to Auburn; Cedar Street, both sides, from Pine to Union; Auburn Street, south side, from Pine to Union; Bell Street, both sides, from Pine to Union; Grove Street, both sides, from Pine to Union; Spruce Street, both sides, from Pine to Union; Central Street, north side, from Union to Pine; and Laurel Street, both sides, from Union to Pine. Those areas are what was approved by the Committee on Traffic. I want to further clarify that this Resident Parking is for those residents that have acquired a Resident Permit through Ordinance Violations.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion to amend the report. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas, Clancy and O'Neil duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman O'Neil stated a major mistake...we're starting to go east of Pine Street with this thing, a major mistake and I'm disappointed. I thought there was an agreement it wasn't going any further east than Pine and I don't know how this all happened and I would appreciate somebody getting back to me on that.

Alderman Clancy stated I'm glad that's Ward 3 and not Ward 5.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to amend the report by adding Green Street. Aldermen Clancy, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Wihby and Gatsas voted nay. Aldermen Vaillancourt, Hirschmann, Levasseur and Sysyn voted yea. The motion failed.

Alderman O'Neil stated the original motion has these other streets east of Pine in it.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied yes it does. If you wanted to remove them you would make a motion to amend the report by deleting the Resident Parking Only section.

Mayor Baines stated you could always send this back to Committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm willing to do this because I don't know how east of Pine Street got in there.

Alderman Levasseur asked may I speak on this, your Honor. A lot of hard diligent work was put into this. You sit here in front of this Committee and you accept their parking meters, you accepted all of their parking garages, you accepted all of the parking increases for all of the stuff that they did, but I'm talking about what we've already set as precedent here. These professionals right here...Denise...all of these people in the Traffic Department brought this to the Committee and said this is where we need to put Residential Parking to protect the people who are almost directly abutting a civic center that's expected to bring six and ten thousand people for events. Where are these people going to park...they're going to park in the neighborhood. This shouldn't even be something that we're even discussing. These people have to be protected with Residential Parking...there is no parking in the back of these houses, most of them are very densely populated...three to four to five family residences, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board. This has already been approved by parking, it was brought in by Traffic, it was brought in by a professional team that know what they're talking about. The neighborhood has already filled out a petition of 300 and it's just crazy...we're just giving them Residential Parking and give the people who live on those small little streets...we're not going that far, we're only going from Pine to Union. It's the right thing to do and this shouldn't even be a big deal.

Mayor Baines stated what I would like to do is get the motion on the floor, first of all.

Alderman Levasseur moved to accept, receive and adopt the report. Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated out of fairness to my colleague from Ward 3 because he has some passion for this would it be fair to table it or send it back because again the last time I remember this Board took a vote it was to go only as far east as Pine Street and I don't remember the Board taking another vote to go any further than that, so I don't know how Bell and Green and all those others got in there.

Mayor Baines stated the Clerk wants to clarify and then I will go to Alderman Levasseur.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk, first of all, has no objection to it going back to the Committee, I just want to clarify that what's in the report was, in fact, approved by the Committee on Traffic. There was a Resident Parking proposal that was presented to the Civic Center Committee as anything does that's related to Civic Center. The Civic Center Committee sent a recommendation to the Traffic Committee. The Traffic Committee decided not to accept that recommendation and did something else which is what is contained in your agenda this evening. So, you can send it back to Traffic Committee, if

you wish and have it further discussed there, but that is where the change occurred is probably between the Civic Center Committee and the Traffic Committee. The Board never voted on this at all, this is the first presentation to the full Board and under State Statute the regulations for traffic would require that the Traffic Committee has to approve anything like this first.

Alderman Levasseur stated with pure deference to Alderman O'Neil because we had discussed this vociferously when it was brought in front of the Civic Center Committee. Now, Alderman O'Neil, I knew where you wanted to not go with this. The original one was to go from Pine to Chestnut, but when we looked over Pine to Chestnut, Alderman, there were no real residents in that area so to let the businesses park from that area and let most of the people that work around that area park on those streets because there's no residents. So, when we looked at it again it really made sense to go from just Pine to Union because that is the most densely populated area. We also left out a couple of streets by the Fire Department and the Police Station where a lot of people park in that area, but there is mostly businesses there, it's not again densely populated by the residences. And, when I went with Mr. Hoben we drove each street and I said make sure that each storefront kept their quarter hour time limits, so everyone was protected in this. Nobody was hurt, the only people that were really protected were just the people...and because there is not a whole lot of parking...just that little section, it's not a big section and like I said we rescinded the Pine to Chestnut and really left a lot more parking for most of the places that are businesses over there. So, there was a lot of thought put into it and I think it's the best plan for the residents and again it is a pilot program...if we want to change it at a future date we should try it now. If this goes back to committee we're going to waste time...they need to get those signs in now while the weather is good.

Alderman O'Neil stated I ask this of my colleague from Ward 3 would you table this to the next meeting, so I can just do it because it's caught me off guard, would you accept that. I want my colleague from Ward 3 to be comfortable with it.

Alderman O'Neil moved to table Item L. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby asked are we tabling just the Resident Parking Only section or the whole report.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied the whole report. There are rescinding provisions in there that are tied to the Resident Parking, as well.

Mayor Baines stated you want to table just the Resident Parking Only.

Alderman O'Neil replied that's my only concern.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I would need to clarify with the Traffic Department which items on here are related because there are other items that say rescind what's there now.

Alderman Wihby stated on page 2 it says Resident Parking, isn't that all you want.

Mayor Baines asked how much time are you going to need.

Alderman Levasseur stated there should be deference to the Ward 3 Alderman in his own ward, I don't go into your wards and tell you where you can or not park. I don't mind if they hear me up there because it's just ridiculous. These are the people that call me everyday.

Alderman Hirschmann stated we took a vote a few months ago about sending things directly to committee and maybe we should rescind that vote because I'm on the Traffic Committee and the Traffic Committee voted this measure up and now that it's in front of the full Board one of the members that didn't attend the Traffic Committee wants to change the whole deal, so are we going to be a Board of committees and get things done in committee or are we going to fool around and come up to the full Board every time that someone doesn't attend the committee meeting and change things because the Traffic Committee voted to do this.

Mayor Baines stated the Clerk will clarify now.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated if you look at the report the first item listed Rescind One-Hour Parking would have to be tabled on Laurel Street and on page 2 of the report the Resident Parking Only section and under Section 26 Rescind No Parking Anytime on Laurel Street and the on Spruce Street and then the One Way Street - Laurel Street. Those are the items that would be tabled. So, maybe we could have the motion read to accept all items on the report with the exception of those items and table those to the next meeting.

Mayor Baines stated that would be the motion that would be on the floor...could you read that once again.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied the motion would be to accept all items on the report with the exception of those previously outlined and those items would be previously outlined would be tabled to the next meeting.

Mayor Baines called for discussion on the motion on the floor as outlined by the Clerk.

Alderman Shea stated I know that Alderman Clancy's concern is that on Green, Grove and Bell Streets if there are stickers from Pine to Union then naturally the people are

going to go from Union to Beech which means that the people in that section are going to be impacted. So, basically that is what your discussion is. I'm not putting words into his mouth, but I'm just saying that there is a small little section there that used to be called "the fields", Jimmy grew up there...he knows the area better than anyone. So, he's trying to look out for his constituents which I can't blame him for. So, the impact is going to come east and that's where you can't solve a problem by having a half a loaf of bread you're only going to have half a loaf, not a whole loaf.

Alderman Levasseur stated we took that into consideration when we went through the plan. We did not, on purpose, include Bell, Grove and Green. So, whoever brought in Green I don't know where that comes from that is the first time I heard of it tonight. Now, the reason why we figured that was because it's far enough away from the Civic Center that anybody who is going to walk from that area is going to probably be residents of the City anyway. Because if you want to walk down that street at night, by a graveyard, around the corner and it's dark go ahead and park there if you want. And, anybody who wants to walk past Union Street or park past Union Street and walk down through that area and come over to the Civic Center is going to be people who live in that area or are residents of that area. I don't think that we're going to have people driving from all around parking between Union and Beech. So, if anyone wants to park that far that's really, really far. We've got plenty of parking east of Pine Street.

Alderman O'Neil stated a question for Alderman Levasseur...that to be honest with you, Alderman, is where my biggest concern is (Bell, Grove & Green). When I see that there that is not what was agreed to...

Alderman Levasseur interjected that's not in there.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is, it's right on the report Resident Parking Only (Bell & Grove) and they want to add Green.

Alderman Levasseur asked only on Pine Street.

Mr. Hoben replied it went from Pine to Union Streets.

Alderman Levasseur stated but not on Bell, Green and Grove. We agreed to that, did you add that in.

Mr. Lolicata replied originally it did.

Alderman Levasseur stated if we take those three streets out, I don't have a problem.

Alderman O'Neil stated if we take those three streets out I'll agree.

Alderman Levasseur stated I did not know that was put back in there, Mayor, because I agree that shouldn't be in there.

Mayor Baines stated the discussion was worthwhile.

Aldermen O'Neil and Pariseau withdrew their motion to table.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the motion would be to amend the report by deleting Bell Street, Grove Street and Green Street (it's not in there, it hasn't been added in yet).

Alderman Levasseur voted to amend the report by deleting Resident Parking Only on Bell and Grove Streets. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Lopez moved to accept the report as amended. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none, the motion carried.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked could I return to Item E very briefly and make another motion.

Mayor Baines replied it's already passed.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I know, but I have another motion that could be relevant, as well. I have no problem with the public hearing and I have dealt with the attorney who put this petition together and I've also talked to Bob Barry of the Department of Transportation. I think this whole question of rezoning this land is a moot point, so I would move that when we have this public hearing we invite Bob Barry of the Department of Transportation who is overseeing the Airport Access Road to make sure he is in attendance at that hearing. I understand that the Department of Transportation is planning to take this land as part of the Airport Access Road and I just want to make sure that everybody else understands that at the time I don't think there's a need to rezone it. Now, the people that want to rezone this seem to think differently, but I have talked with Bob Barry twice since talking with them and there are no change of plans about that land for the Airport Access Road to take it. So, I would move that we make sure that when this public hearing is held we invite the DOT and also the Airport Director to be at that hearing. The DOT is planning to take that land for the Airport Access Road, the petitioner wants to rezone it so he can put a hotel up there.

Mayor Baines asked, without objection I would just ask the Clerk to send an invitation to those people.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I would appreciate that, so that we can make it crystal clear that the Department of Transportation does fully intend to take that land for the Airport Access Road, so there will not be a need to rezone it.

6. Confirmation of nomination of Karen Rumfelt to succeed Harriet Blanc to the Board of Personnel Appeals, term to expire March 2004.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Ms. Rumfelt to the Board of Personnel Appeals, term to expire March 2004.

7. Confirmation of Chester Raymond to succeed William Trombly to the Board of Adjustment, term to expire March 1, 2004.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Mr. Raymond to the Board of Adjustment, term to expire March 1, 2004.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to recess the regular meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.

Mayor Baines called the meeting back to order.

10. A report of the Committee on Finance was presented recommending that Resolution:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2001.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

Alderman Sysyn moved to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee.

Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

A report of Committee on Traffic/Public Safety was presented recommending that a request on behalf of the Downtown Farmer’s Market for closure of streets, a no parking ban, reinstallation of banners on lighting fixtures in and around the Hartnett Lot and erection of the barn in the southwest corner of the Hartnett Lot be approved under the direction of Highway, Risk, Traffic, Police, Fire, Building and City Clerk.

Alderman Clancy moved to accept, receive and adopt the first report of the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

A second report of Committee on Traffic/Public Safety was presented advising that that it is presently reviewing the current parking fines and based on anticipated increases in the fine rates recommends that the Board include \$250,000 in additional anticipated revenue from parking fines in the FY2002 budget.

Alderman Clancy moved to accept, receive and adopt the second report of the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the Clerk told us we had to have a public hearing for that.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied no, what the Committee is advising is that they are intending to recommend rate increases. Those rate increases would be presented to the Board in a report. What we advised the Committee is that they would also have to recommend that the Committee on Accounts review it and determine whether or not they feel a public hearing is warranted and that would be voted on by the Board.

Alderman Hirschmann stated so a public hearing in the future is warranted.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied it may or may not be, it depends on what the Board action is in the future.

Alderman Levasseur asked is the number that's been given here been prorated because we're talking November to...or I'm just wondering how the number...oh, okay, so we're not talking just about the Civic Center. Oh, okay, thank you.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

12. Appropriation Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘Approving the Community Improvement Program for 2002, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefore and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program.’”

Alderman O'Neil moved that Item 12 the CIP Appropriating Resolution be tabled until June 11, 2001. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

**13. Communication from Alderman Lopez to Mayor Baines, reference:
Ceremony for Memorial Day and Veterans Day.**

Mayor Baines stated I think Alderman Lopez would like to say a few words.

Alderman Lopez stated I bring this to your attention because of the City Charter. We've relied on individuals over the years to do Memorial Day and Veteran's Day Parades, but I think it's very serious that we honor our veterans that have given their lives on Memorial Day and on Veteran's Day for those who came back in victory. I think it should be the responsibility of this City to have an appropriate ceremony to ensure that the veterans of this City are honored and moved that it be referred to the City Clerk's Office for appropriate ceremonies and programs and to inform the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Shea stated I just want to commend Alderman Lopez for bringing that to our attention. I think he is to be commended, I think that obviously as a veteran himself and others who are veterans including myself have that feeling and I think he took the time and effort to do that and call it to out attention and I think he is to be commended for that, he is a very responsible citizen.

14. Communication from Lloyd G. Basinow requesting a referendum question be placed on the November 2001 municipal ballot regarding amending the City Charter to remove the reference to Welfare Department.

Alderman Vaillancourt moved that Item 14 be received and filed. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

15. Communication from the City Clerk advising that they are applying to the Bean Foundation for a \$20,000 grant to fund a temporary Project Records Analyst to work with the City's Archivist.

Alderman Pinard moved to authorize application of grant funds. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

16. Communication from Department of Highways submitting a PSNH Easement for AES Pumping Station Service.

Alderman Lopez moved to approve the agreement and authorize the Mayor to execute same subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau asked what does the City gain by allowing this private entity an easement over their property.

Mr. Sheppard replied we don't gain anything by allowing the easement of Public Service, we do have an easement for AES who is using our secondary effluent for cooling at their plant and they are paying us a per gallon fee and it's increased revenues at our treatment plant.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated yes, I would speak to that line going down Brown Avenue if you don't mind, your Honor. You realize about a month ago we had a disastrous situation with a traffic jam down there because no planning had been done in advance when they just shut the traffic down and school buses couldn't get through to get to school for a day. Now, I'm having several calls from people that live in the area regarding how their houses are being contaminated with dust from this line going in and maybe we could look for the City Solicitor to respond to some of these people whether we might get some cleaning of the houses that are being negatively impacted by this line that's being put through there. I'm getting many calls from constituents along that area that are concerned. And, also, to keep the dust down when they're putting that line through. I'm continually asking for that but we're not getting the proper treatment down there.

Mr. Sheppard stated we work with the contractor and to work in the streets in the City they do have to provide the necessary insurance, so any homeowner who has concerns and feel as though they have a claim we've got that information.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked they should contact you then.

Mr. Sheppard replied sure, they can contact me directly.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

17. Communication from Destination Manchester Coordinator reference: Senior Center Sites.

Mayor Baines asked Mr. Bill Jabjiniak to make a presentation to the Board. While waiting for Mr. Jabjiniak to get ready, Bill last Friday represented the City at an awards ceremony over in Peterborough...Manchester was recognized for some historic preservation activities especially associated with the Chase Block and some other projects, so we're very thankful for all who participated in both the past and present to earn that award for Manchester.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated a little over a month ago the Board asked me to evaluate the lease/purchase of two sites for a senior center; one, being 1415 Elm Street and the other one being 265 Maple Street. We've actually developed three alternatives and Randy Sherman was instrumental in developing this analysis. One is to continue leasing the location on Hanover Street. It's 5,145 square feet...the landlord has come back and proposed a two-year lease at the same terms which includes two parking spaces. The second one is the lease/purchase of 265 Maple Street which is a 7,100 square foot building with 41 existing parking spaces. We have an appraisal done on the building (\$490,000), the owner's have also appraised the building...they've conducted that separately and it's \$500,000...we would obviously have to reconcile that \$10,000 difference. But, the \$500,000 is carried in this analysis. The owner's of the Maple Street property have agreed to a lease/purchase arrangement with the price being fixed for a three-year term. The lease rate is \$11.00 triple net and the purchase can happen any time over the 3-year period. Occupancy would be November 1 of this year. The sheet that's been handed out, I believe, shows a total net present value for this project of \$823,502 which a break even point at year 8. On page 2 is the lease/purchase of 1415 Elm Street. That is a 54,000 square foot building actually with 48,000 of leaseable space. The Elderly Center is proposed to be new construction in the rear of the lot, not in the existing building and would leave approximately 123 parking spaces to serve the elderly and the office building. The handout describes three scenarios: one, is to continue leasing for all of the departments; two, is the lease/purchase of the building; and three, is the outright purchase of the building now. The terms of the lease/purchase proposal are outlined on the handout in the notes at the bottom and I think the best alternative after you look at the continuation of leasing option is a straight purchase with a net present value of \$9,159,675 and Randy is available for questions on that. The only thing I want to wrap up with, your Honor, for reminders this is a focus on a Senior Center, not on office consolidation. Both lease/purchase scenarios allow for three to five years to appropriate funding and the existing landlord wants an answer by June 15th and the Teamster's would also like an answer in that same time frame.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated it seems to me we could discuss this for several hours here tonight and probably will if we so choose and I think we have a committee that would be the appropriate place to refer this to and those people that want the answer by June 15th might just have to wait a couple of weeks. So, I think this should probably go to the committee that's been working on this, it's not an issue that can be resolved having just been handed these numbers in the next 10 or 20 minutes or so, I would think it should go to committee.

Alderman Levasseur moved that Item 17 be referred to the Committee on Lands and Buildings. Alderman Vaillancourt duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it would be appropriate if we hear some more information from you, Bill...the minuses and pluses on each site and also from the Finance Department with their recommendation before it goes to committee. I agree with Alderman Cashin this goes back and forth, back and forth...whatever your recommendation is I think you indulge yourself in this, so what are the minuses and the pluses.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied briefly I will tell you that the site on Maple Street is in move-in condition...Barbara and Claire both have taken a tour with me recently...I think we carry \$50,000 for any additional work they may want to do over and above the purchase. It's substantially bigger than what they have now, it creates an additional amount of parking and it's within reach within the next three-year term; that's the pluses. The location has come up as a concern, I think for the East Side Center it's certainly a solution and it can also be considered a temporary solution. The Sear's site is a substantial site, it offers a lot of other alternatives for office consolidation, but from a building standpoint that is something that the Board would have to consider...that is my pluses and minuses.

Alderman Shea stated I know you have a committee that is going to tour different centers, I think that they are starting their touring June 20th they're going to Portland, Maine and then Portsmouth, NH, but from what I hear I know that the East Side Community Center has become more active and I believe that Barbara can probably give us a little information in terms of how that has increased in the amount of people going there, if she would like to come up and explain...if you would, Barbara, your population has increased and so forth.

Mayor Baines interjected I don't know, Alderman, if tonight...

Alderman Shea stated what I am directing my attention to is that rather than precipitously jump at a lease/purchase or anything like that I think that, right now, possibly it's better to remain where we are for the present until we can examine all of these things. If Lands and Buildings doesn't do anything until we meet again then you have to be committed beyond the budget period to the leasing of Hanover Street...I'm not sure but I would assume that somehow we have to do some kind of decision on Hanover Street.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated I do know that the current landlord has issued a letter which I have a copy of that says this proposal automatically expires on June 15th. The current landlord has issued a letter to Barbara indicating that the proposal to renew their lease at the current terms for another two years does expire on June 15th.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think I know what's going to happen...I'll give you a preview...it's going to go to Lands and Buildings, it will come back 3 to 2 for neither one of these two situations where we'll be back right into square one. So, again, your honor, I

want to withdraw my motion and if Mr. Vaillancourt will withdraw his motion, I will move to receive and file. Let's have a vote if we're going to have one of these sites because we're just going to be beating ourselves over the head again.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I'm not prepared to withdraw my second, I still think we could debate this for a couple of hours tonight...that's why we're here until midnight. The proper process would be to send this to committee...maybe divine intervention will come forth.

Alderman Cashin stated as Chairman of the Committee on Lands and Buildings I'm happy to accept this, we'll look at it and do what we can, but these people deserve an answer and we've got to find an answer for them and I'm referring to the three properties, not just any one. We've either got to fish or cut bait.

Mayor Baines stated what I would suggest if it went to Lands and Building that we have a special Board meeting to put this whole matter to rest within the next couple of weeks...that is what I would suggest if we send it to Lands and Buildings, we do have a special meeting scheduled on June...

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated on June 11th you will be dealing with the budget and it would be next week.

Mayor Baines stated we could have a special meeting after that within a week. I would suggest we send it to committee.

Alderman Pinard stated I've been listening to this Senior Center for three, three-and-a-half years...I agree with Bill Cashin that this has been dragging long enough. I think the seniors of this City are getting fed up with us because we don't seem to be able to make a decision. But, the decision is right here because we have until the 15th on one thing and we have until June something to review the contract on Hanover Street. Hanover Street as far as I'm concerned is worthless. I would like to move and make a motion...

Mayor Baines interjected there's a motion on the floor.

Alderman Pinard stated let's go ahead tonight and vote on this and get it behind us and get the senior there on Maple Street and down the road...it's a good piece of property and when I here there is no parking I'm sure that Frank Thomas, with his equipment, can make another additional, 30, 40 or 50 spots in back there's land available; that piece of property is very vital to the City of Manchester...we take it, we save our money and in a few years we can build a new one for the seniors, but let's move forward. I think we've been dragging long enough. Thank you.

Alderman Gatsas stated, Bill, forgetting about a senior at Sears so we can talk about consolidation and see how that affects the City because I think that is just as important as looking at anything else. Can you give us a scenario also based on consolidation.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated yes, we can develop that and get back to you.

Alderman Gatsas stated disregarding the seniors, just consolidation and what that would mean to the City and what savings that would be.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated we can develop that and certainly get back to you. I do know that lease expiration dates are going to be an issue, but I do have that and can certainly work with Finance to develop that for you.

Mayor Baines asked what is the deadline we have from the Teamsters.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied also June 15th.

Alderman Hirschmann asked are you negotiating with the Grossman Companies, is that who this is.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied they're broker that they have designated.

Alderman Hirschmann asked what happened to the "Tenant at Will" status that the Board directed to go to get.

Mayor Baines asked did we ask them...Barbara, could you come up and answer that question.

Alderman Hirschmann stated we could rent month-to-month.

Ms. Vigneault stated right after the Board authorized me to go to the landlord, I did and they have sent the letter that Bill was referring to saying that they are proposing a two-year lease at the same rate for that two years.

Mayor Baines stated the question was did we ask them if we could become "tenants at will".

Ms. Vigneault replied yes that was in the request and this is their proposal back.

Mayor Baines stated the answer is no, then.

Ms. Vigneault stated right, but their two-year offer is less than the five-year option term that we have currently.

Mayor Baines stated we just wanted to know if we could do month-to-month.

Alderman Hirschmann stated we did want to know if we could maintain the facility month-to-month while we figured out our situation.

Mayor Baines stated that might be a question we might want to ask again depending on what happens here tonight.

Alderman Levasseur stated here we go...the budget's going to be finalized by the 15th...where are we going to go and find the money to do all the stuff. If we decided to go with Sears we would have the money, we only have \$1.2 million for a stand alone site, so again here we go, are we going to all of a sudden come up in July when we decide we're going to do this with the money to do this right or are we going to commit the funds. I really think that Mr. MacKenzie from the Planning Department was on top of all the numbers and was doing this for at least a year-and-a-half, so to have another guy jump in and now just give us all this dissemination...

Mayor Baines interjected it was passed to do it by the Board.

Alderman Levasseur stated I didn't ask them to do it by the Board, I just think it should have stayed where it was so we'd be able to be consistent with what's going on here. You wanted them to go over to the Board, I'm not trying to get into any fights or anything, but you wanted them to go because you guys really have your mind made up on Maple Street. Your Honor, I don't think there's enough votes on the Board to go with Maple Street, so again, we're just wasting more time and I don't think we even have the money after June 15th, I don't know where we're going to come up with an additional amount of money unless you guys have some other pot of gold that I don't know about yet.

Mayor Baines asked are there any further questions from the members of the Board before we act on this and refer it to committee. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

18. Communication from Destination Manchester Coordinator requesting the Board authorize the use of competitive sealed proposals pursuant to Section 39.07 of the Procurement Code for design, build, operation maintenance and financing of an open air parking structure at the northwest corner of Bridge and Elm Streets.

Alderman Cashin moved to authorize the use of competitive sealed proposals pursuant to Section 39.07 of the Procurement Code as requested. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Baines asked are there any questions of the Board before we call for a vote and acknowledged Alderman Levasseur.

Alderman Levasseur asked could you explain to us why you want to do it this way. Obviously, it must be better for the City...why aren't we doing it this way all the time, is there a reason specifically for that. Your Honor, is that a fair question. Didn't we do that for the Bond Building, I think we allowed them to go to the sealed bid process, I don't know whatever ended up happening with that.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied this is something that has been talked about, Alderman Gatsas has pushed for it also in the past...

Mayor Baines stated it's probably something we should be doing more and should have been doing more in the past.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated our current codes requires us to go through this competitive sealed bid and we were asking relief from that process to go to the sealed proposals.

Alderman Levasseur stated the reason they were doing it prior must have been the wisdom of some Board at some point who said we have to do it that way and what was their logic or reasons for keeping it open.

Mayor Baines stated that is probably the way we've always done it, did you wish to respond Mr. Clark.

Solicitor Clark stated it was built into the previous City Charter to require competitive sealed bidding and the present City Charter continues that process until this Board decides on a new one.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think that I've been asking for a change in the Procurement Code for probably the better part of a year and I think I've been patient and I think this Board has been patient enough because it's an antiquated times of what we do with the Procurement Code, so maybe we need to set a date (final) to have a Procurement Code in front of us because I think we've been waiting and I haven't seen one.

Mayor Baines stated could we just do this and I'd be glad to accept a motion with that in mind, but any questions from Mr. Jabjiniak on this issue.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe he could explain to us what this means.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated to explain what the process simply means is...

Mayor Baines asked could you please introduce the gentleman you brought up here with you.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied to my right is Curt Sanborn the President of the Sanborn Group. Curt is responsible for introducing this concept to me about design/build finance. He tells me it's been done in other areas of the country and I think I'm going to ask Curt to go ahead and explain the process in a little bit more detail.

Mr. Sanborn stated the design/build process has been around for some 12 years. It started actually in Utah when they needed to expand the highways around Salt Lake City for the Olympics, the State couldn't afford it so they did a design/build/finance/operate of the interstate that has now been built to handle the traffic going into the upcoming Winter Olympics. Since then, 22 states have adopted the enabling legislation to go forward with design/build/finance projects. New Hampshire did a design/build, not finance on the jail in Berlin and it was very successful. Design/build in itself simply requires the contractor and the engineers to work together to eliminate the longevity of the design process. So, typically where you would have a full design before it would go out to bid, the contractor works hand-in-hand with the engineers to design and then go build it. Typically in a case, I can use an example of Route 3 in Massachusetts which has been done design/building/finance/operate...typically, would have been a 15 to 17 year project...that selected contractor Modern Continental will have that completed in 42 months and they will also operate it. They finance, in this case, themselves and takes it off the bonding of the state and it's a debt service paid back similar to a mortgage payment (line item). In the case of this project what makes it attractive for design/building/finance/operate is the combination of the parking garage and the hotel. The selected team will not only have the garage to build and generate some sort of debt service payback through the revenues that come into the garage, they can stretch that out over a longer period of time simply because they also know they are going to pick up the contract to build the hotel. So, it makes it a very desirable design/build/finance project and to take on the liability of the financing of the garage.

Mayor Baines stated I know it's something we've talked about, I know Alderman Gatsas brought up and I've had some conversations with some of my colleagues and mayors in different parts of the country that have used this very successfully on a number of projects for the reasons you've just outlined, so I think it makes sense for us to proceed with this here in Manchester.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated and also, Alderman Gatsas, Mr. Thomas is working on that and we could ask Mr. Thomas to communicate with the Board (in writing) in terms of when he plans to have that before the Board, if you would agree to that.

Alderman Gatsas stated I want a date certain, your Honor.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I did just speak with Kevin Sheppard...they are working on a Procurement Code, they are looking at the design/build provision. He did indicate roughly two to three months is a possibility that they would be shooting to complete that, to have a draft before the Board.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that two to three months or two to three years.

Mayor Baines stated we could ask Mr. Sheppard to respond.

Alderman Gatsas stated I might not be here for the next two or three terms.

Mr. Sheppard stated Frank has actually set up a committee within our department to take a look at the Procurement Code and there are actually quite a few items to take a look at because that Procurement Code as it exists today does not include a lot of items out there like design/build, for example, and what I'd like to do is discuss this with Frank and as the Mayor suggested come back to the Board with a letter and give a date.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Kevin, are you taking a look beyond construction and capital wasn't...Alderman Gatsas I don't want to speak for you, but I think I recall, some of the discussions is how we purchase paper to maybe building schools and everything in between, am I correct.

Alderman Gatsas replied absolutely, Alderman.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that part of your scope or are you just look at the capital side.

Mr. Sheppard replied we are looking at the entire Procurement Code.

- 19.** Communication from Parks, Recreation and Cemetery submitting an access agreement with Wilcox & Barton, LLC for groundwater monitoring wells at Sweeney Park.

Alderman Thibault moved to approve the agreement subject to execution of a Hold Harmless Agreement and Certificate of Insurance; and authorize the Mayor to execute such agreement subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Thibault stated we have a gentleman on the west side in my ward that takes care of this park by himself, at his own expense, and I just want to be sure that if these people go on there they will guarantee that they put that park back in the condition that it is in right now. This man works there four to five days a week, free to the City...takes care of this park completely. So, I just don't want it to be torn up and not fixed up properly after.

Alderman Thibault moved to amend the motion with the understanding that the park be restored to its original condition. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion to amend. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- 20.** Communication from Director of Planning requesting authorization to extend a contract with Manchester Community Resource Center on Lake Avenue through December 2004.

Mayor Baines asked the Clerk to clarify the note in Item 20.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied there is no agreement presented for the Board to approve.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the reason is that the contract has not yet expired. The contract does expire roughly a year-and-a-half from now, the organization would like to make their contract consistent with the City's contract with the federal government, so they can run the program until the year 2004; that is why there is no contract in front of you. I think they were looking for a concept...whether the Board would support that extension.

Mayor Baines stated we are just supporting the contract extension and then you would come back to the Board with an approval of the contract.

Alderman Pariseau moved to approval concept of the contract extension with contract being presented to the Board at a later date for approval. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated I know last year we gave them \$75,000 in CDBG to purchase the building next door and then this year they came back to us for \$20,000 because they said that the person who they made the deal with to purchase that building upped the price to \$95,000 from \$75,00 to \$99,000 which is why they never ended up buying the building there's still a For Sale sign on it. It seems remiss that anybody who negotiated this thing before we gave them the money that they would have had a Purchase and Sale Agreement in their hands for the price so stated at \$75,000 and now I'm still worried because I don't think that there is a Purchase and Sale Agreement in our hands, they came back for \$20,000...what's to stop this guy from saying forget it I want to go to \$110,000 and now we're just building a fund for these people.

Mr. MacKenzie stated as I understand it it would be the MCRC purchasing the building. There has never been an agreed upon price, just some tentative prices discussed. There have been proposals made and those proposals have not been accepted. So, they are hoping to purchase the building to expand the center, but no agreed upon price has been reached.

Alderman Levasseur stated when I was in conversation with the people and I spoke with the person in charge of that they came to this Board and said we're paying \$75,000 for that and we gave them the \$75,000 and I thought it was the right thing to do because that's a nice piece for them to grab. Again, there's another \$20,000 sitting there and they still don't have a P & S in-hand and I think if at any other time we have these opportunities to buy these buildings let's have the Purchase and Sale Agreement in-hand because again we don't know what that money's doing. Where is that money actually the \$75,000 is it in a bank somewhere, Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie replied those are funds that are federal funds, they are still in Washington, they have not been drawndown yet.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

21. Communication from Rabbi Jacob Rosner requesting a change in the City's Charter to avoid having an Election Day on a Jewish Holiday in the future.

Alderman Shea stated I suggest we receive and file, but we send a letter indicating that in lieu of changing any kind of election day that we send...indicating that people can vote by absentee ballot on that particular day simply because there might be conflicts with other religions on other holy days particularly All Saint's Day or whatever. So, I believe that we shouldn't discriminate against any religious group.

Mayor Baines stated could I ask the Clerk to respond before we take a motion.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated obviously the Board can take any action it pleases. I did review this with Mr. Bernier earlier this evening and the State does not make exception for that simply reason, but certainly if the Board wanted to consider it they could refer it to the Committee on Administration, I think was one of the committees that Leo had suggested to look at it. The letter that is in the agenda also contains the dates for the next five years...there is no conflict with any of the Municipal Primary or General Elections for the next five years.

Mayor Baines recommended that we take that course of action to give this due and careful consideration.

Alderman Levasseur moved to refer Item 21 to the Committees on Administration/Information Systems and Bills on Second Reading. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I don't understand what Bills on Second Reading or any other committee can do. This is a clear cut matter. Alderman Shea has expressed it precisely right. We could conceivably go to a position where we could be voting on a Christian holiday, the United States government has considered voting on Sundays, so be it if that's the case. We shouldn't make exceptions for any religion, we should deal it with a blind eye toward religion, so I resent this.

Mayor Baines stated I believe they've made a legitimate request of government. I think we have the responsibility to consider it and then respond.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked are you debating it now.

Mayor Baines replied no, absolutely not. I'm just stating a matter of fact. So, let me leave it there and then I'll make another recommendation.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Shea and Vaillancourt duly recorded in opposition.

Mayor Baines stated I'd like to inform the Board that I will be working with the City Clerk's Office (it's already done) to disseminate the information about the absentee ballot procedures throughout the Jewish community so they are aware of it, so we are taking a pro active stance in terms of addressing the issue as well.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated we're doing something special for the Jewish community by disseminate absentee ballots isn't that what the problem in Florida was all about.

Mayor Baines stated the Clerk will clarify.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated it sounds like we're doing something that is unconstitutionally improper.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we are not distributing absentee ballots. We are distributing information regarding absentee ballot process to the Jewish community as requested. The Clerk's Office has worked with other senior centers, nursing homes and other organizations over the years and has done special voting drives when requested, it's not an unusual thing that we would do.

Mayor Baines stated Mr. Scannell of my office has also been working on this issue.

Mr. Scannell stated in 1979 the State passed a law which allowed for the religious exception for absentee ballots precisely because in the late 70's there was this conflict.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated the question is did it pass an ordinance or a law saying that you should work with them to get the ballots out to the community, this sounds like a special deal that is improper by any State statute.

Mr. Scannell stated it's constituent service.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated it is not constituent service, it's singling out one group of constituents which I just read the Supreme Court ruling in Bush v. Gore...clearly, is going toward one group which is in violation of the United States Constitution.

Mayor Baines asked, Mr. Clark, would you like to render some thoughts on this subject.

Solicitor Clark stated I believe it's proper for the City to disseminate information on how to get absentee ballots to the voters.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked to any specific group of voters or to anybody in general.

Solicitor Clark replied to any voters who request the information.

Mayor Baines stated they requested it and I think it's the proper thing for government to do.

Alderman Cashin stated, Mayor, what you're saying is not only will you do it for the Jewish population but you will do it for anyone that requests it.

Mayor Baines replied absolutely. I believe it's a service that we're obligated to provide and as Mayor I will continue.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated that would be acceptable, but you're original explanation was that you were going to do it for the Jewish community only.

Mayor Baines stated I don't believe I said it exclusively, I apologize if you got that impression; that is not our intent and we will respond on a constituent service basis and we're very proud to do it.

Alderman Levasseur asked when you disseminate the information, I would hope that it would come from the City Clerk's Office and not from any specific person in government such as the Mayor's Office or any such...

Mayor Baines replied no, it is just that we have worked with the City Clerk's Office on this issue as we work on a lot of constituent issues.

Alderman Levasseur stated you can understand what the people are thinking like what's going on.

Mayor Baines stated I do very much and thank you for sharing that with me.

22. Communication from Kathy Trisciani relative to safety concerns at Livingston Park.

Alderman Lopez stated I talked with Ron Ludwig and moved that Item 22 be referred to Parks and Recreation for a response because it is a temporary situation at that particular ballfield and he's looking at it, but has yet to come up with a solution and report back to the full Board.

Alderman Lopez stated in talking to Mr. Trisciani who is a coach there is a possibility that when they practice that somebody could get hurt. As you read the document the bench was put up in that particular area so the kids wouldn't hit the cement wall until Ron Ludwig gets an opportunity to address the situation.

Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated that is all well and good but these people did write a letter last December asking that this get addressed and was guaranteed it would be addressed and come spring time and it wasn't addressed. So, they did send a letter to the Parks and Rec Commission last December.

Mayor Baines stated again that is an issue that we have been involved with and I know that I did play telephone tag a couple of times on that issue but Dave Scannell has been working on that in my office, David.

Mr. Scannell stated when the incident happened when the boy ran into the wall they indicated they were happy with the response and satisfied and come to find out at the time of opening day that nothing had been done...he has put up a fence, I believe that the Trisciani's don't feel that that is adequate, but then subsequently fortified to make it sturdier and Mr. Ludwig is looking at other alternative at this point in time.

Alderman O'Neil stated they'll let the Board know what the resolution is to that problem, thank you.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

23. Resolution:

“A Resolution adopting new plans entitled the City of Manchester Flexible Benefits Plan, the City of Manchester Health Care Reimbursement Plan, and the City of Manchester Dependent Care Reimbursement Plan.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted that the resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted that the Resolution be adopted.

24. Resolution:

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2001.”

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Resolution pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

- 25.** Communication from Alderman Vaillancourt regarding HB429 relative to binding arbitration for city disputes (includes original communication, memo regarding Dover, memo regarding Portsmouth, and also a communication from the Chief Negotiator in opposition to HB429.)
(Tabled April 17, 2001.)

Alderman Vaillancourt moved that Item 25 be removed from the table for discussion. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated the reason this item was tabled, I believe, was four weeks ago was because we had just received information at the time and a suitable amount of time was needed to digest the information. So, regardless of what you want to do with the item, I think that we certainly have had more than enough time to look at the information, so that it should be removed from the table. I will point out that this is regarding HB 429 which would mandate binding arbitration for policemen and

firefighters for cities in the state and certain towns. I would point out that the Senate had a hearing on the bill, I believe it was two weeks ago yesterday or two weeks tomorrow, I think, and at that hearing speaking in opposition was the Mayor of Portsmouth, the Mayor of Concord, the Mayor of Lebanon, the Mayor of Keene, a representative from Nashua Mayor Bernie Streeter, representatives from Rochester, Laconia, Durham, Derry...almost every city in the State and the towns affected. This is an issue that transcends parties, that transcends those of us who are elected versus labor. This is an issue where anybody who is an elected official in a city or town should jealously guard the prerogative as Mayor Sorel of Portsmouth said of watching how contracts are negotiated and I would point out, your Honor, that's is very interesting that while this bill would mandate that cities and towns would have to go into binding arbitration there's nothing right now that would prevent the City of Manchester from going ahead on its own even if this bill fails, this illustrious body could say yep we abdicate our responsibility, we're going to go to binding arbitration. So, you don't really need this bill.

Mayor Baines asked are you arguing to remove it off the table.

Alderman Vaillancourt replied yes, I am arguing to remove it off the table with justification why we should take action why we should take action once it's removed from the table, but that would be my argument to remove it off the table. It was put there simply because at the time we didn't have time to consider the ramifications of it, but by moving it off the table we would get in step with every other city in the state.

Alderman Levasseur stated I remember it was about three meetings ago that I had asked you what we were going to do about this and you referred "I am in the process of doing some research on this issue while I was looking at how it impacted other states" and Alderman Hirschmann..."the information that the Board is going to get could that include an opinion from public safety officials like the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief and even yourself, your Honor," and Mayor Baines answered "absolutely, I am researching this and spending quite a bit of time on it because I was waiting for something that you were doing a lot of research and all that and what you were going to come back with as an opinion.

Mayor Baines stated as I recall it was on the agenda at the last meeting and the Board chose not to take it off the table.

Alderman Levasseur stated I was expecting you to come back with some sort of a report for us. In your minutes, you told us you were going to be researching this and you were spending a lot of time on this issue and, your Honor, I think that as the Mayor of the biggest City in the State of New Hampshire that's imperative that you also send a message to the State on what you decide should be done and I think, your Honor, you do have a side on this issue...I'm not afraid to come out and say that I don't approve of

sending arbitration (without approval of this Board), I think this Board should try to maintain as much control over contractual negotiations as it possibly can and again as Alderman Vaillancourt said if we come to a disagreement we could always do so and as the head of the City, your Honor, we had one representative come up and we should be giving a message and I want that message...

Mayor Baines stated the Board of Mayor and Aldermen has the ability to go on record in support...individual Aldermen could be up there testifying if they want to testify as well as any other elected officials; that is your prerogative...any Alderman could have been up there, as well...and citizens.

Alderman O'Neil stated to my knowledge Alderman Vaillancourt is absolutely correct...those local officials did attend and testify, but to the best of my knowledge they were stating their personal...not one of them said there was a vote taken of a Town Council or a Board of Aldermen for them to go up there and do that, they were stating their personal opinion as an elected official in that local community.

Alderman Vaillancourt interjected that is just not true. Point of order, your Honor, when incorrect information is disseminated, I feel that it is only correct to correct it. There were people at that meeting that read proclamations from their board of mayor and aldermen...how you can say that is just beyond me.

Alderman Wihby stated there's a lot of times and meetings that were set up with this bill and as a Labor Department employee, I went to some of them and I didn't see anybody at those meetings, any city or official that was against doing this back before the bill was even put together when they had the Study Committee not one person was coming speaking against this from any official (including Manchester) at the time and I think we had the meeting right here at City Hall...they met in Nashua, they met in Claremont and Dover and every place else and not one person came in to speak against the proposal and I think that's why it went through the House and Labor Committee and got to where it is.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated that is why every other city in the state now has become alarmed over this once the information has finally gotten out to them and has decided that now is the time to take a position while there still is a chance; that is why the urgency is now. When this work was being done in the middle of the summer time and these were not publicized, as your representative/negotiator, I wouldn't have even known about this had your City Negotiator not come and told us a couple of days before it appeared before the House. I didn't know anything about it and I've served in the House for five years now that is why it's received such a momentum that it's come forward at this time and every other City, as I say, has already gotten on Board for this. If you don't want to do anything about this, fine, but at least it should be moved from the table so that something can be done, it shouldn't just sit at the table, the reason for putting it on the table was so

that we could look at what's happened and Alderman Levasseur is exactly right that the Mayor did say he was studying this and I deliberately avoided trying to move it off the table the last meeting two weeks ago, so that we could have more time to ruminate over this, but certainly we've had our rumination time by now and everybody must have an opinion as to how they want to go on this.

Mayor Baines called for a vote to remove Item 25 from the table.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion. Aldermen Vaillancourt, Cashin, Hirschmann, Levasseur and Shea voted yea. Aldermen Pariseau, Thibault, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, O'Neil and Lopez voted nay. Aldermen Wihby and Gatsas abstained. The motion failed.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated the reason it was put on the table was so that we could have time to look at it. So, let the record show that we were given false information when we put that on the table. The reason was not so we could look it, the reason in fact was to kill it. So, let the record reflect that we were given false information when it was tabled.

Alderman O'Neil stated let's stand corrected. I asked that it be placed on the table so that you could all be presented information which you were presented, let's state the facts correctly, Alderman.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I believe I did.

26. Report of Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue

Administration:

Advising that it has accepted a School audited financial statements report from the Finance Department, as enclosed, and is submitting same to the Board for informational purposes.
(Tabled May 1, 2001.)

This item remained on the table.

27. NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Wihby asked for our own information is the court date still set for tomorrow.

Mayor Baines stated the Solicitor will advise the Board.

Solicitor Clark stated presently the court date for tomorrow has been continued. The Boards had asked the attorneys to talk some more...as a result, the discussions were taken to the Mayor and there will be a committee established of I believe three members of the Board and three members of the School Board, four members of each Board to sit down and discuss the issues.

Alderman Wihby asked at whose request was it canceled...School, Mayor, Aldermen or who.

Solicitor Clark replied the original request came from the Attorney for the School Board to our office. We discussed it with the Mayor and it was felt that in the spirit of trying to work out a settlement, if possible, that the Boards ought to be given the chance to discuss it.

Alderman Wihby asked when is it rescheduled to.

Solicitor Clark replied the case is still pending in court, but the hearing has been scheduled to the call of either party.

Alderman Wihby asked which committee are we talking about.

Solicitor Clark replied it's a committee that would be established by the Chairman of this Board and the Chairman of the School Board.

Mayor Baines stated I am distributing a memo to the Board. As you know we are responsible for updating the Five-year Capital Projects Plan and the memo indicates that I have been working with Mr. MacKenzie on this and if you have some input before we bring the matter to the Board, please submit that information to Mr. MacKenzie.

Alderman Levasseur stated when we got home from our meeting last night, I had a message on my machine and it was to say that Parkside, somebody who knew what was going on and the children had run out of paper and that they were asked to take back their papers after they were corrected and to use the backside of their paper. We've had discussions, your Honor, about the schools and the Superintendent and what the responsibility of that department is and I just thought that the timing of running out of paper while we're about to discuss whether we're going to go with the full budget that they asked for or your budget, your Honor...

Mayor Baines stated how can they be running out of paper when he said at the meeting that he was anticipating having a \$70,000 surplus...

Alderman Levasseur stated that was the question of the day and also I'd just like to say to anybody that's out there is that I sent over a case of paper just to help them out and maybe we need to get a paper drive, your Honor, for the last 10 days of schools. I doubt that we need to, but again this is the kind of message that is sent by whoever the administration, down to the teachers, down to the kids to make us feel like we have to put this pressure on ourselves to make us look like a bunch of jerks because the kids don't have paper. I

think it's bad faith negotiation on their part, I think it's the worse type of negotiation that you can ever use is to use these kids against the people who are running the City.

Mayor Baines stated I would also say that if there are any other situations like that if they would contact the Mayor's Office so we can follow-up on it. I'd be glad to do that personally.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just wanted to follow-up and I mentioned this to Alderman Levasseur out back when he mentioned that point to me. About three weeks ago I got a call from a teacher saying almost identical...I don't believe it was the same teacher...identical...we're out of paper and the word from Bridge Street was that the Aldermen had cut our budget.

Alderman Levasseur stated that is what's been going on, your Honor.

Alderman Shea stated I did discuss this with Alderman Levasseur and you as a former Principal and myself as a former Principal realize that we are putting our requests for paper prior to the beginning of the school year and then usually around January there's another request. So, I'm not saying that Bridge Street is responsible, I'm saying that sometimes we have to trace to the source. If someone in a building is not doing their job and ordering the necessary supplies the burden of proof may be on them rather than on someone else.

Mayor Baines interjected that's a good point and that could be the case and let's give the benefit of the doubt.

Alderman Pariseau stated I just wanted to know if we're going to do anything with this letter we got from Commissioner Lafond.

Mayor Baines asked did I get a copy of the letter.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied we're making more copies, we didn't get to that item yet.

Alderman Wihby stated you can't tell me that there isn't extra paper in other schools that they could have just moved around and sent some to the other schools.

Mayor Baines stated that is a possibility as well and we generate an awful lot of paper here at City Hall at these meetings...

Alderman Hirschmann stated I received from Howard Tawney and all the Aldermen received a "Bonus Report" and it shows bonuses given to City employees in the years

2000 and 2001 and I was just astounded at some of the employees received bonuses of over \$2,000...numerous ones.

Mayor Baines interjected I was too, I ran down to the Human Resources Office when I saw that list.

Alderman Hirschmann asked could we make a referral to the Personnel Committee to possibly look at it in the future of capping of bonuses. Maybe it could be capped at \$500, \$1,000...\$2,000 for a bonus...what are these people doing.

Mayor Baines replied that was set up under the Yarger Decker system...

Alderman Hirschmann stated I think we could amend that system...

Mayor Baines stated perhaps we could and I appreciate your bringing that up because we've had some conversations. I know Alderman Lopez and I have talked about it and a number of others.

Alderman Hirschmann moved that the Bonus Report be referred to the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance for review and report back to the full Board. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated just a clarification on the system, it's the recommendation of the department head to the Human Resources Director, the Executive is not involved in that decision at all, we need to look at that.

Alderman Levasseur stated I've been kind of inundated with a lot of requests about the situation where we are going to be building a fourth high school and I think it's been out there a lot, people have been discussing it, it's been in the paper hither and dither, I would like to say that if we sent a letter to the School Board stating that we did not want them to move out of the Administration Building. I would also like to request that we send a letter to the School Board saying that we do not wish to build a fourth high school because I don't feel that there is a lot of support for that and I think that we could be talking about more important things. I think the City should build a fourth high school when the other high schools we have are not up to par.

Mayor Baines stated the Board has not made any official position on that at all, it's been something that has been discussed.

Alderman Levasseur stated they had only been discussing the Administration Building so I don't see why we couldn't send a letter to that if someone would second my motion.

Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Baines stated we do have an elected School Board that hasn't even acted on that issue either.

Alderman Wihby stated I have no problem with the motion, there's some letter...I got it today or got it at home, but it was dated from the School Board after we had 14 votes (unanimously) that said not to move and they said they're interested in Hackett Hill and it's almost like we're going to send this and they're going to write back saying they want a fifth high school.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would just like to send that letter so that people out in the City know where we stood on this issue.

Mayor Baines stated we've never received presentations on the subject or analysis of the subject and we can't make any conclusions without that.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked wouldn't this have to come to this Board before we could build that anyway.

Mayor Baines replied absolutely.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so unlike when they're considering it's something they could do on their own and we send them an advisory opinion, I'd go along with it but don't let anybody think they could do this without approval anyway.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would just like to send an advisory opinion, your Honor.

Alderman Wihby stated I have not problem with that but to follow-up to Alderman Vaillancourt also on the...probably, when we voted to tell them that we don't want them to move I guess we all assumed they could go ahead and do what they wanted. I guess the City Solicitor is telling me though that if they want to do anything more than one year they're going to have to come back to this Board anyway. So, if they're thinking of moving out for less than a year that's fine, if it's more than a year his recommendation is that they are going to have to come back to this Board in which case, hopefully, we've assured them that they're not going to.

Alderman Hirschmann stated we did receive that communication that they're interested in French Hall, shouldn't we in fact reply to them if they want French Hall they could have it for "X" amount...

Mayor Baines asked shouldn't that request go to a committee of the Board, Lands and Buildings.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that building cost \$2 million.

Mayor Baines stated that letter should go to Lands and Buildings with a recommendation back to the Board.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it's been said through our Chairman for cooperation and trust...why don't we get the opportunity for the School Board to make their presentation before we just jump the gun. They have to come back to us anyway, so I don't know what the big deal is right now.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to send a letter to the School Board telling them they shouldn't consider a fourth high school. Alderman Levasseur, Sysyn, Pinard, O'Neil, Shea, Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann, Wihby and Gatsas voted yea. Alderman Lopez voted nay. Alderman Clancy was absent. The motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated okay we'll send a letter. I think there are some legitimate issues for the School District to explore and they're going to do it as they want to anyway, but they have a right to explore and make recommendations; that is what they have been elected to do, they're elected officials. They're elected by the same people that elect us.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I wish to apologize publicly to AT&T. At a couple of meetings ago, I suggested that their raise for cable service was an outrageous \$6.00. I went into a friend of mine who works for AT&T and told me it was only \$1.40, I said I'd believe when I'd see it. I did in fact see it, the raise indeed of \$6.00 is if you have Internet service with cable. For the Basic service it is only \$1.40 and you get NESN for a part of that. So, I do want to apologize publicly to AT&T for any misrepresentation I may have made, it's not \$6.00 it's only \$1.40 with the Bruins and Red Sox thrown in to boot.

Mayor Baines read a communication from Welfare Commission Lafond into the record as follows:

This is to inform you of an emergency personnel situation in the Welfare Department requiring your immediate assistance. It is necessary to hire a minimum of four (4) caseworkers as quickly as possible. Since time is of the essence, social workers from a temporary agency must be used initially.

There are four (4) caseworkers out indefinitely on medical leave. The remaining staff of two (2) caseworkers, one Intake worker and Deputy having borne the entire caseload recently, are also ready to go on sick leave.

There are no funds in the Salary line item with which to pay temporary employees. As you know, the Welfare Department will also require Contingency or Account Balance Funds in order to meet its client rent obligations.

It has been suggested to me that the remaining employees forego their upcoming vacations due to the staff shortage. I don't believe that is a viable solution. I believe it will only hasten additional medical leave.

Consequently, the Department will be without a minimum of five (5) caseworkers in July and August. We are without five (5) caseworkers today.

We simply do not have enough people to see those in need of assistance and meet our statutory obligation.

My hope is that we will be able to find former social workers that would be willing to work in a temporary position for a few months.

please let me know what else you may require. I, of course, will be available at any time to answer any questions.

Thank you for your assistance,

Very truly yours,
s/Susan G. Lafond
Commissioner

Alderman Hirschmann moved to approve the request to hire temporary employees.

Alderman Pariseau asked where are you going to get the money.

Alderman Hirschmann replied we're statutorily bound, Alderman.

Mr. Sherman stated we still have about \$95,000 left in the Contingency account. Right now, the Commissioner obviously has asked for some of that money for rents and Public Building Services has also asked for some of that money, but we have been monitoring those. We think the \$95,000 will provide sufficient funds to cover.

Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I thought she had requested \$75,000 for other items and we only have \$95,000, so I'm a little confused.

Mr. Sherman stated the whole idea is one how quickly we can get people on and what the cost of that is going to be and at this point the worse case scenario you're probably only talking about seven or eight thousand dollars to get us to the end of the year. In monitoring the PBS number one of the things...the item that was causing them the problem was the electricity up at French Hall and my understanding is now that the heating season is over they've really cut back up there and again we're monitoring their balances and we don't think that they are going to need very much to cover their

deficiency. So, between what Ms. Lafond is looking for and with what PBS Is looking for even with this additional money we'll have sufficient funds.

Mayor Baines asked, Commissioner, what would be the approximate cost of covering this situation.

Commissioner Lafond replied as Randy said I'm looking at under \$10,000 for the rest of the year.

Alderman Cashin asked can we put a caveat not to exceed \$10,000.

Commissioner Lafond stated sure I have some other possibilities.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to amend his motion that the amount not exceed \$10,000. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion to amend. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated the suggestion is to move the July meeting to Monday, July 2nd because of a conflict with the Fireworks.

Alderman Pariseau asked couldn't we have it the 10th. Alderman Vaillancourt stated I'll second the 10th.

Alderman Thibault stated I won't be here the beginning of July.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated we should have the whole week of the Fourth of July free.

Mayor Baines stated I'm away that next week.

Alderman Wihby suggested July 17th.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the regular Board meeting for July be held on Tuesday, July 17th. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated we are having a Special School Board meeting tomorrow afternoon at five o'clock. The public notice reads to consult with legal counsel and also dealing with issues that the Board may wish to consider with the Superintendent on the budget and overruns in the budget.

Alderman O'Neil moved for reconsideration of the July date. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm on vacation the third week of July, so we get elected, we know we're suppose to meet the 1st Tuesday of the month whether there's other holidays affected or not.

Mayor Baines stated that's the problem in July. Some people are off the first week, July is a vacation month, it's up to the Board.

There being no further business to come before the Board, on motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Levasseur, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk